

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,010	09/17/2003	Ga-Lane Chen	6596	
25859	7590 05/19/2005		EXAM	INER
WEI TE CHUNG			HODGES, MATTHEW P	
FOXCONN INTERNATIONAL, INC. 1650 MEMOREX DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			2879	
			DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,010	CHEN, GA-LANE	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	-
	Matt P. Hodges	2879	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	_
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nety filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status	•		
1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a)☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☒ This 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E.	action is non-final. ce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 September 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ object frawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/17/2003.	4) Interview Summary. Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa		

Application/Control Number: 10/666,010

Art Unit: 2879

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (US 5,990,618) in view of Miller. (WO 98/40431).

Regarding claim 7-9, Morita discloses (see figure 2) a plasma display panel including a panel (100), a heat sink (2) connected to the back of the panel by means of a thermal adhesive (50). The heat sink includes a plurality of fins extending away from the substrate. (Column 5 lines 19-40) Morita further recognizes that inclusion of a high-orientation layer between the panel and heat sink advantageously reduces temperature variations between the heat sink elements and improves the heat sinking effect. (Column 10 lines 43-49). Morita does not appear to specify the use of a orientated material for the thermal interface adhesive, however Miller, in the same field of endeavor, discloses the use of a carbon nanotube adhesive film to connect electronic devices and heat sinks. The use of a carbon nanotube adhesive film advantageously improves the heat conductivity of the adhesive element and therefore improves heat dissipation

Application/Control Number: 10/666,010

Art Unit: 2879

in the display panel. (Page 4 lines 11-20). Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate the carbon nanotube adhesive layer as disclosed by Miller into the plasma display panel as taught by Morita in order to advantageously improve heat dissipation in the display panel.

Regarding claims 10-12, Morita in view of Miller discloses the device as claimed and likewise the manufacture of that device including filling the space between the heat sink and substrate with the adhesive layer.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (US 5,990,618) in view of Getz, Jr. et al. (US 6,771,502).

Regarding claims 1 and 3, Morita discloses (see figure 2) a plasma display panel (see rejection of claim 7 above). Morita further recognizes that inclusion of a high-orientation layer between the panel and heat sink advantageously reduces temperature variations between the heat sink elements and improves the heat sinking effect. (Column 10 lines 43-49). Morita does not appear to specify the use of an anisotropic material for the substrate of the heat sink, however Getz, in the same field of endeavor, discloses the use of an anisotropic base under conductive fins for an electronic device heat sink. The use of an anisotropic base advantageously improves the heat conductivity heat sink and therefore improves heat dissipation in the display panel. (Column 4 lines 34-40). Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate the anisotropic material for the substrate of the heat sink as disclosed by Getz into the plasma display panel as taught by Morita in order to advantageously improve heat dissipation in the display panel.

Application/Control Number: 10/666,010

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 5, Morita further discloses the thermal interface being about 0.1 mm thick. (Column 5 lines 19-21).

Claims 1, 2, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (US 5,990,618) in view of Miller (WO 98/40431) and further in view of Getz, Jr. et al. (US 6,771,502).

Regarding claims 1, 2, and 4, Morita in view of Miller discloses (see figure 2) a plasma display panel as claimed (see rejection of claim 7 above). Morita does not appear to specify the use of an anisotropic material for the substrate of the heat sink, however Getz, in the same field of endeavor, discloses the use of an anisotropic base under conductive fins for an electronic device heat sink. The use of an anisotropic base advantageously improves the heat conductivity heat sink and therefore improves heat dissipation in the display panel. (Column 4 lines 34-40). Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate the anisotropic material for the substrate of the heat sink as disclosed by Getz into the plasma display panel as taught by Morita in view of Miller in order to advantageously improve heat dissipation in the display panel.

Claims 1, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (US 5,990,618) in view of Krassowski et al. (US 2003/0183379 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Morita discloses (see figure 2) a plasma display panel (see rejection of claim 7 above). Morita further recognizes that inclusion of a high-orientation layer between the panel and heat sink advantageously reduces temperature variations between the heat sink

Art Unit: 2879

elements and improves the heat sinking effect. (Column 10 lines 43-49). Morita does not appear to specify the use of an anisotropic material for the substrate of the heat sink, however Krassowski, in the same field of endeavor, discloses the use of an anisotropic base under conductive fins for an electronic device heat sink. (See Abstract) The use of an anisotropic base advantageously improves the heat conductivity heat sink and therefore improves heat dissipation in the display panel. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate the anisotropic material for the substrate of the heat sink as disclosed by Krassowski into the plasma display panel as taught by Morita in order to advantageously improve heat dissipation in the display panel.

Regarding claim 6, Morita in view of Krassowski discloses the device as claimed, but does not appear to specify the use of aluminum fins. Morita in view of Krassowski disclose the use of plastic fins that have a lower weight but also a lower heat dissipation than aluminum fins. Thus in cases where greater heat dissipation warrant additional weight, it is known to include materials that increase heat dissipation such as aluminum fins. It has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to have used aluminum fins on the highly conductive graphite base as disclosed by Morita in view of Krassowski, since the selection of known materials for a known purpose is within the skill of the art.

Conclusion

Page 6

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Smalk (US 2002/0166654 A1) discloses the use of anisotropic bases for a heat sink.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matt P Hodges whose telephone number is (571) 272-2454. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mph Wift

Mariceli Santiago An 2879